

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on September 20, 2006, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 12, 20 and 26 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-12, 17-21, 23-26 and 29 are now pending in this application.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 17-20, 25, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stockdale (U.S. 6,575,833) in view of Muir (U.S. 5,923,249).

Stockdale describes a battery powered security monitoring system having a tamper detection mechanism (Fig. 3 & 4, block 322, 'Security Monitoring System') with a tamper detection controller (id. block 400, 'Sensor Monitoring Circuitry'). Specifically, Stockdale describes that Sensor Monitoring Circuitry uses an optical, mechanical or magnetic sensing device for detecting an open door in a gaming machine.

Muir describes an add-on security system designed to be fitted into an existing security mechanism. Specifically, Muir describes a security subsystem which adds a battery backup detector to one or more open door detection switches. The switches can be either optical or mechanical sensors.

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that neither Stockdale nor Muir, alone or in combination, teach or suggest an enhanced security method and system for a self-service machine as taught by Applicant and claimed in claims 1, 7, 17, 20 and 26.

Applicant teaches and claims in claims 1, 7, 17, 20 and 26, that Applicant's retrofitted tamper detection mechanism adds an additional open door detecting device (e.g., Fig. 5, block 16 and 18, an emitter and a sensor, respectively). The detecting device added exists separate from an existing security mechanism such as a switch for detecting and generating an open door detection signal. Applicant further teaches (e.g., Figs. 5 & 6) and claims in claim 1, 7, 17, 20 and 26, that Applicant's tamper detection mechanism activates an existing open door detection signal generated by the existing security mechanism when an open door is sensed either by the existing

security mechanism (e.g., 'switch' system) or by the tamper detection mechanism itself (e.g., the sensor).

As recognized by Applicant at page 2, lines 2-10, the dual sensing structure for detecting an open door status is important for preventing an unauthorized person from bypassing a gaming machine's existing security system by shorting an open door detection signal generated by the existing security system. As also noted at page 4, lines 8-13, Applicant teaches that, by using Applicant's approach, one can add an additional security system (i.e., tamper detection mechanism (20)) to existing machines (10) in order to leverage the existing system without having to make extensive changes to the existing system (10).

Under Stockdale's approach, Sensor Monitoring Circuitry uses only a single sensing mechanism for determining open door status. (See Fig. 4, a signal from a main door sensor 206). As the Examiner notes, however, Stockdale does not have a second sensor mechanism operating in conjunction with the first as claimed by Applicant in claims 1, 7, 17, 20 and 26.

Likewise, although Muir states that the sensing of a main door must be done in both optical and mechanical ways (Spec. col. 2, lines 22-24), Muir does not teach or suggest modifying an existing open door signal using a signal from a different sensor as taught by Applicant and claimed in claims 1, 7, 17, 20 and 26.

Instead, Muir describes a battery backup open door detection system for use in an emergency. As noted at col. 2, lines 62-63, Muir describes:

Standard and optional security is designed so that when the security module is added it can **share the same sensors** [as the standard security system's].

Also, as noted at col. 3, lines 32-34, Muir further describes:

The sensors are arranged to be shared between the detector circuits on the main board and the external optional add in module known as the "Security Subsystem".

Under Muir's approach, therefore, an existing security system (e.g., the detector circuits on the main board) and an newly-added security system (e.g., Security Subsystem) use the same sensors to detect an open door status. Applicant is unable to find in Muir any teaching or suggestion that Muir takes a signal from an existing detection mechanism and adds an additional sensor and the requisite circuitry to detect an open door in a different way.

In addition, although Muir's Security Subsystem is retrofitted into an existing security system, Muir's retrofitting is designed to solve a different problem from the problem solved by Applicant. The solution of which is claimed in claims 1, 7, 17, 20 and 26.

As noted at Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 35-45, Muir's Security Subsystem addresses an emergency situation caused by power being removed from the main machine. To solve this problem, under Muir's approach, sensor interfaces (107) of Security Subsystem are connected in parallel with sensor interfaces (108) of the existing security system to share access to the existing sensors (109).

In contrast, Applicant teaches that Applicant's tamper detection mechanism prevents bypassing a gaming machine's existing security system by shorting an open door detection signal generated by the existing security system as discussed above. To accomplish this, for example, as noted at Fig. 5 and page 5, lines 6-18, Applicant teaches that the tamper detection mechanism is added in series or parallel, as necessary, to an existing security mechanism (i.e., switch).

Such an approach allows for the addition of additional detection devices without the need to add an additional alarm or program to an existing microprocessor.

For the reasons discussed above, neither Stockdale nor Muir, alone or in combination, teach or suggest an enhanced security method and system for a self-service machine using an existing tamper detection signal and modifying that signal to detect an open door status in a different way as taught by Applicant and claimed in claims 1, 7, 17, 20 and 26. Claims 1, 7, 20 and 26 have been amended to emphasize this difference. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

With regard to claims 19 and 26, claims 19 and 26 are patentable as being dependent on a patentable base claim. In addition, neither Stockdale nor Muir, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a security method and system generating an alarm even if an open door is not detected by the existing detection mechanism as taught by Applicant and claimed in claims 19 and 26.

The Examiner states that "the combination [of Stockdale and Muir] teaches [that] the method comprises generating an alarm if the existing gaming machine signal is not detected". As support of this, the Examiner points to col. 8, lines 39-65 of Stockdale and col. 3, lines 64-65 &

col. 4, lines 34-36 of Muir without any specific comparison between Applicant's claimed inventions and the references.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited portions describe a security system using only one signal from the same open door detection source as discussed above. Applicant is unable to find any teaching or suggestion of generating an alarm even if an open door is not detected by the existing detection mechanism as taught by Applicant and claimed in claims 19 and 26.

Claims 6 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stockdale (U.S. 6,575,833) in view of Muir (U.S. 5,923,249), in further view of Droz (U.S. 4,370,644).

Claims 6 and 12 are, however, patentable as being dependent on a patentable base claim. In addition, none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a tamper detection mechanism (i.e., security subsystem) using a relay as taught by Applicant and claimed in claims 6 and 12.

The Examiner states that "Droz teaches multiple sensors incorporate with a relay operates to activate/energize the open door detection signal to trigger the alarm when the sensors detect[s] that the door is open". The Examiner further states that "it also provides a switching and triggering element to interface different electronic components to corporate as a whole unit". As support of these, the Examiner points to Figs. 6 & 7 and col. 4 line 50 through col. 5, line 25 of Droz.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited portions just describe using a relay between open door detection sensors (switches) and an alarm. Unlike the Examiner's assertion, however, Applicant can not find any teaching or suggestion of specific use of a relay for activating an open door signal using two different signals from two different detection mechanisms (e.g., an existing open door detection mechanism and an add-in security module) as described and claimed by Applicant.

With regard to claims 2-5, 8-11, 18, 21, 23-25 and 29, claims 2-5, 8-11, 18, 21, 23-25 and 29 are patentable as being dependent on a patentable base claim.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney at (612) 373-6909 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

VICTOR MERCADO ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6909

Date

Nov 10, 2006

By

Thomas F. Brennan

Thomas F. Brennan
Reg. No. 35,075

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 10 day of November, 2006.

Name

Peter Rebuttoni

Signature

Peter Rebuttoni